

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of affirmative action. It is my understanding that a bill is being introduced today which will prevent the Federal Government from taking affirmative steps to remedy the still widespread discrimination that we have in employment, contracting, and education.

Today, discrimination is still rampant. A recent study conducted by the Fair Housing Council found that minorities are discriminated against 40 percent of the times that they seek to rent an apartment. Repealing affirmative action will, therefore, have the practical effect of resegregating America. The repeal of affirmative action programs in both Texas and California gives us a peek at what happens when we eliminate affirmative action.

So we must ask the opponents of affirmative action if they achieve their goals when minority admissions to law schools in Texas and California dropped precipitously in spite of evidence that shows that minorities, when given the opportunity, will perform as well as their majority counterparts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask, how far do we have to turn the clocks back to appease those that are disgruntled, because discrimination is being remedied?

IT IS HIGH TIME FOR AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as James McDougal, former business partner of President Clinton, begins his prison sentence today, I think we should take a look back at some of the additions to the American vocabulary in just the last few years: Whitewater, Filegate, Troopergate, Travelgate, Lippogate, Pillowgate, Donorgate, Indo-gate, and who could forget Buddhist Templegate.

Goodness gracious, and Janet Reno says there is no need for an independent counsel? Yeah.

AMERICANS ARE FED UP WITH FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in Boston for the last 14 days the Sweeney family has literally barricaded their property, fighting the Federal Government who they say is trying to take their home. Now, I do not know who is right or wrong in this case, but one thing is for sure. Many American people are fed up with fat cat government bureaucrats.

Open your eyes, Congress. EPA, IRS, FBI, FDIC, ATF, intimidation, liens and seizures, technicalities, regulations, on and on, and every single day more messages and signals keep com-

ing to Washington; and no one here seems to be listening.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just Texas and Idaho, now it is Michigan, New York, and even the wealthy suburbs of Boston. I say, Mr. Speaker, what is next? Maybe another Tea Party? Do not be surprised when a nation that forgets their history is many times apt to revisit it.

TAX CUTS FOR PEOPLE WHO PAY TAXES

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it should be a no-brainer that tax cuts should go to people who are taxpayers. Many Americans might well wonder how anyone could even think of, let alone give, a tax cut to people who do not pay taxes. But remember, this is Washington.

Words mean nothing. That is why tax cuts are still a defining difference between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans are for tax cuts.

Republicans believe that hard-working Americans deserve to keep and spend more of the money that they earn. For too long, Democrats opposed any tax cuts for working Americans as gifts from Washington to the so-called rich.

Now, some Democrats claim they support tax cuts. However, actions speak louder than words. It turns out the Democrats and the President's proposed tax credit for children would transfer more money from the pockets of taxpayers to the pockets of people who pay no taxes.

Americans are wondering, Mr. Speaker, why is the Democrats' child tax credit more like welfare spending than a tax cut?

REPUBLICAN TAX PROPOSAL IS DISAPPOINTING

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the Republican tax proposal. Under this plan, the majority of the tax benefits go to the wealthiest Americans, those making over \$250,000 a year; almost 58 percent of their tax breaks go to people making over \$250,000 a year.

I think that we ought to provide the bulk of tax relief to working, middle-class families in this country, to the families who are trying to figure out how to pay their monthly bills, put food on their table, send their kids to school, and provide for a secure retirement and be able to afford health care. These are the families who could use tax relief in this country today.

Let me just say that this is simply not a Democratic issue. One of my Republican colleagues, in a television ap-

pearance with me this morning, stated that providing big tax breaks for families who make over \$250,000 a year is not the right way to go. I encourage more of my Republican colleagues, speak out about the need to provide tax relief to those families who really need it: hard-working middle-class Americans.

□ 1415

INTRODUCTION OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY NITROGEN OXIDE LIM- ITATION ACT OF 1997

(Ms. CARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, the Electric Utility Nitrogen Oxide Limitation Act of 1997. In the current debate concerning the new EPA rulemaking for clean air, I trust that my bill will pass and provide an alternative for Members who want to vote for clean air.

My bill will reduce by 55 percent the nitrogen oxide levels emitted by fossil fuel-burning electric utility plants by the year 2000. It sets a simple standard of 0.35 pound per million Btu to be met by the electric utility plants by the end of the year 2000.

It will also ensure that electric competition encourages, not discourages, responsible, efficient emission control. It is a bill that is proconsumer and proenvironment. It will ensure competition for utilities, but not at the expense of air quality.

This bill will do all of this without amending the Clean Air Act. While the debate rages on concerning EPA rulemaking and the States debate standards that will not be in place until 10 years from now, I encourage my colleagues to join me.

AN IMMENSE AMBITION FOR POWER

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, "Attention turns to Aristide as the Haitian Government crumbles," says the news report this weekend. "An immense ambition for power" is responsible for insecurity and disorder in the Capital, Port-au-Prince. This is how one-time confidante Paul DeJean describes former President and his former friend, Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti.

In fact, this sentiment is nothing extraordinary. If we peruse the weekend press on Haiti, it appears to be a mainstream opinion as Haiti drifts deeper into misery and despair. Reports from the wire and from Michael Norton of the Washington Post describe a litany of Aristide's increasingly obvious efforts to advance his own personal ambition at the expense of economic recovery and at the expense of democratization in Haiti.